UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,771	06/12/2006	Rudolf Huber	0002600USU/4122	7860

27623 7590 07/07/2009

OHLANDT, GREELEY, RUGGIERO & PERLE, LLP
ONE LANDMARK SQUARE, 10TH FLOOR
STAMFORD, CT 06901

EXAMINER	
EARLES, BARRY K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/07/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/562,771	HUBER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BARRY EARLES	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 June 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *34-62* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *34-62* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12 June 2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 34-62 are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) submitted on 12 June 2006 has been considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486).

34. (New) Rao discloses *a mobile phone comprising* (col. 1, lines 20-22)*:*

communications means for communicating via a telephone communication network, the telephone communication network comprising a plurality of stationary base stations, the plurality of stationary base stations having a present base station Rao discloses a mobile unit in communication with base stations (Fig 1)*;*

detection means for detecting both a strength value corresponding to the strength of

a signal received from the present base station and an identification code of the present base station (col. 2, lines 5-9; col. 3, lines 48-51)*;*

position information reception means for receiving an information signal of a satellite-based positioning system (col. 2, lines 11-13)*;*

first computation means for computing a current position of the mobile phone based on the signal received by the position information reception means (col. 3, lines 16-19)*;*

first storage means for storing the positions computed by the first computation means as first position values (col. 5, lines 20-22) *;*

second computation means for computing the current position of the mobile phone based on the strength value and the identification code detected by the detection means The specification of the application being examined says on page 8 that the first and second computation means can be integrated. Therefore, the limitation is shown.*;*

second storage means for storing the positions computed by the second computation means as second position values; and, Rao discloses internal memory (col. 5, lines 20-22). The specification of the application being examined says on page 8 that the first and second storage means do not need to be physically separated.

position message compiling means for compiling a position message comprising a plurality of most current position values computed by the first and second computation means, wherein the communication means can send the position message via said telephone communication network., Location information generated by the GPS receiver is transmitted by the MU to the Other Party (col. 3, lines 19-21).

As to claim 35, the Mobile Unit (MU) can move. The MU can be in different cells (col. 1, lines 20-25; Figs 1, 2). The rest of claim 35 is described in claim 34 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Corbett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,351,642). As to claim 36, Rao discloses first and second position estimates and additional position estimates which are available (col. 1, line 52 - col. 2, line 28). Rao does not expressly disclose direction and a velocity of motion. Corbett et al., in the same field as Rao, discloses a velocity vector of a mobile station. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the velocity vector or Corbett with the additional estimates of Rao; because, the combination could be part of

a technique for soft hand-off that selects cells for the active set in which the mobile station is likely to stay in longer so as to reduce signaling overhead in the system and to reduce the burden on system resources (Corbett, col. 2, lines 43-47).

Claim 37 reads on Rao and Corbett as applied to claims 36 and 34 above.
Claim 38 reads on Rao and Corbett as applied to claims 36 and 34 above.

As to claim 39, Rao discloses status information includes the state of the GPS receiver in the mobile unit and the availability of satellite signals to the GPS receiver in the mobile unit (col. 2, lines 13-17). There is a call setup, or setting, between the mobile unit and a remote party (col. 1, lines 60-67). Other settings include cellular network signaling parameters (angle of arrival, time delay of arrival, signal strength, etc.) which are used to compute the location of the MU (col. 1, lines 27-29). A message compiling means is described in claim 34 above.

8. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Okuyama et al. (US 2001/0005859) and Schroeder et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,405,060).
As to claim 40, Rao does not expressly disclose status setting, authorisation code. Okuyama et al., in the same field as Rao, discloses a status setting part 24 of a client (0123; Fig 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the status setting part of Okuyama with the MU of Rao of claim

34 above; because, the combination could be part of sending and receiving text messages with mobile terminals such as mobile phones in real time according to the utilization status of dynamically-changing information terminals (Okuyama, 0016). Neither of the previously mentioned references discloses authorization code. Schroeder et al., in the same field as Rao, discloses a telephone prompting a user for an authorization code, such as a Personal Identification Number (col. 9, lines 7-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the authorization code of Schroeder with the MU of Rao of claim 34, as modified above; because, the combination could be part of a hand-held cellular telephone system that offers various 'user-friendly' features that are easy to use despite the space limitations of a keyboard and display inherent in a hand-held design (Schroeder, col. 1, lines 30-33).

9. Claims 41 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Squibbs (US 2002/0004404).
As to claims 41 and 43, Rao does not expressly disclose a service centre based on a request of the service centre. Squibbs, in the same field as Rao, discloses a service center using an output request. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the service center and output request of Squibbs with the communication system of Rao; because the combination could be part of using local equipment by a mobile entity (claim 43) (Squibbs, 0018).

10. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Squibbs (US 2002/0004404) and Schroeder et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,405,060).

As to claim 42, Rao does not expressly disclose an authorised person. Schroeder et al., in the same field as Rao, discloses a telephone prompting a user for an authorization code, such as a Personal Identification Number (col. 9, lines 7-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the authorization code and user of Schroeder with the MU of Rao of claim 34; because, the combination could be part of a hand-held cellular telephone system that offers various 'user-friendly' features that are easy to use despite the space limitations of a keyboard and display inherent in a hand-held design (Schroeder, col. 1, lines 30-33).

11. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Squibbs (US 2002/0004404) and Gardner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,819,182).

As to claim 44, Rao does not expressly disclose a message identification code for identifying the requested message. Gardner et al., in the same field as Rao, discloses if each message identification code is unique, then two messages having the same message identification code are assumed to be the same (col. 3, lines 49-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the message identification code of Gardner with the request of Squibbs of

claim 43; because, the combination could be part of providing a narrowband PCS system having the advantage of improved gain and signal-to-interference ratio normally achieved by base stations in systems using sectored cells (Gardner, col. 2, lines 61-67).

12. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Squibbs (US 2002/0004404) and Nohara et al. (US 2002/0034954).

As to claim 45, Rao does not expressly disclose special format short message service. Nohara et al., in the same field as Rao, discloses information which can be formed by a format such as SMS (Short Message Service) (0059). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the format of SMS (Short Message Service) of Nohara with the request of Squibbs of claim 43; because, the combination could be part of an information distribution system which can efficiently distribute information which meets desired conditions of the user to a mobile terminal apparatus (Nohara, 0006).

13. Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Squibbs (US 2002/0004404) and Fitzgerald et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,963).

As to claim 46, Rao does not expressly disclose *an emergency button, is automatically sent to, based on an operation of the emergency button.* Fitzgerald et al., in the same field as Rao, discloses an inbound message can by initiated by a rental car driver

depressing an emergency button to transmit the location of the vehicle to the MOC (col. 11, lines 35-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the emergency button of Fitzgerald with the MU of Rao; because, the combination could be part of a data communications system in which a very remote or highly mobile field unit may initiate, on its own, the transmission of relatively small amounts of data to a mission operation center (MOC) (Fitzgerald, col. 2, lines 57-61).

14. Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Squibbs (US 2002/0004404), Fitzgerald et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,963), and Kuwahara et al.(U.S. Patent No. 6,389,288).
As to claim 47, Rao does not expressly disclose *alarm mode performing means, wherein the alarm mode performing means can terminate any telephone connection besides, automatically answer a phone call.* Scott, in the same field as Rao, discloses a mobile station transmits an on-hook signal to the IN platform, which terminates the connection. An alarm signal informing destination caller 1405 of what has occurred can be provided (col. 29, lines 22-26). terminating the connection and alarm signal of Scott with the MU of Rao; because, the combination could be part of a system and method for providing customers the ability to communicate in either a cellular frequency mode or in a personal communications service (PCS) mode (Scott, col. 2, lines 6-9). Scott does not expressly disclose automatically answer a phone call. Kuwahara et al., in the same field as Rao, discloses an automatic answer phone service (col. 5, lines 17-20). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the automatic answer phone service of Kuwahara with the MU of Rao, as modified above; because, the combination could be part of automatically executing communication service whereby an area indicated by the reported location information is identified so that the setting of a mobile communication terminal is automatically changed (Kuwahara, col. 2, lines 54-58).

15. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Squibbs (US 2002/0004404), Fitzgerald et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,963), Kuwahara et al.(U.S. Patent No. 6,389,288), and Attimont et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,389,297).

As to claim 48, Rao does not expressly disclose *a hands free set means, automatically activate the hands free set means.* Automatically activating is disclosed in claim 47 above. Attimont et al., in the same field as Rao, discloses a hands-free set comprising a terminal (col. 3, lines 39-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the hands-free set of Attimont with the MU of Rao; because, the combination could be part of providing a radiocommunications terminal whose cost and volume are low (Attimont, col. 1, lines 60-61).

16. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Squibbs (US 2002/0004404), Fitzgerald et al.

(U.S. Patent No. 5,734,963), Kuwahara et al.(U.S. Patent No. 6,389,288), and Tanaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,493,693).

As to claim 49, Rao does not expressly disclose *emit an alarm signal via a load speaker*. Tanaka et al., in the same field as Rao, discloses an alarm control circuit which drives a speaker unit to generate an alarm warning (col. 5, lines 38-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the alarm warning and speaker unit of Tanaka with the MU of Rao; because, the combination could be part of providing a novel cellular radio communication system which permits a user to optionally designate the desired radio communication format so that he can more effectively utilize digital communication mode in particular (Tanaka, col. 2, lines 21-25).

17. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Squibbs (US 2002/0004404), Fitzgerald et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,963), Kuwahara et al.(U.S. Patent No. 6,389,288), and Sudo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,039).

As to claim 50, Rao does not expressly disclose *disable any keys or a touchscreen*. Sudo, in the same field as Rao, discloses a function for disabling operations by keys (col. 7, lines 6-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the disabling operations by keys of Sudo with the MU of Rao; because, the combination could be part of a control method of a communication terminal apparatus (Sudo, col. 1, lines 57-59).

18. Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Squibbs (US 2002/0004404), Fitzgerald et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,963), Kuwahara et al.(U.S. Patent No. 6,389,288), and Natarajan (U.S. Patent No. 5,212,806).

As to claim 51, Rao does not expressly disclose *resend if no call is received from in a first predetermined time period after.* Natarajan, in the same field as Rao, discloses if no positive acknowledgement (ACK) is received within a predetermined time-out period, mobile unit 10 resends a message (col. 8, lines 31-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the resending a message if no acknowledgement is received in a predetermined time-out period, of Natarajan, with the MU of Rao; because, the combination could be part of a method for detecting the movement of mobile units as they move from one communication cell to another (Natarajan, col. 3, lines 45-48; col. 1, lines 63-64).

19. Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Squibbs (US 2002/0004404), Fitzgerald et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,963), Kuwahara et al.(U.S. Patent No. 6,389,288), and Kohut et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,741,931).

As to claim 52, Rao does not expressly disclose *automatically establish a phone connection to in a second predetermined time period after.* A predetermined time period is described in claim 51 above. Kohut, in the same field, discloses automatically

establishing a mobile phone connection with a vehicle (col. 5, lines 44-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the automatically establishing a mobile phone connection with, of Kohut, with another time period within the time period of claim 51; because, the combination could be part of providing a more economical navigation system which may be incorporated into a broader range of vehicle categories (Kohut, col. 1, lines 24-27).

20. Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Squibbs (US 2002/0004404), Fitzgerald et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,963), Kuwahara et al.(U.S. Patent No. 6,389,288), and Kabe (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,089).

As to claim 53, Rao does not expressly disclose *automatically switch on if is in an off-state*. Kabe, in the same field as Rao, discloses the power of a portable terminal device being automatically turned on from a power-off status (col. 6, lines 33-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the automatically turning the power on from a power-off status, of Kabe, with the MU of Rao; because, the combination could be part of a portable terminal device that can help users carry out data communication without difficulty even in an environment where the operation of the portable terminal device is not easy (Kabe, col. 2, lines 10-14).

21. Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Squibbs (US 2002/0004404), Fitzgerald et al.

(U.S. Patent No. 5,734,963), Kuwahara et al.(U.S. Patent No. 6,389,288), Mattila (US 2002/0178356), and McDonnell et al. (US 2002/0055361).

As to claim 54, Rao does not expressly disclose *a termination of only on receipt of a reset message, wherein the reset message comprises a reset authorisation code.* Mattila, in a field similar to Rao, discloses a termination which can include a reset message (0098). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the termination and reset message, of Mattila, with the MU of Rao; because, the combination could be part of a lighter system for providing authentication for users of IPSec based secure communications systems (Mattila, 0009). Neither of the aforementioned references discloses authorization code. McDonnell et al., in the same field as Rao, discloses a server returning an authorization code (0055). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the authorization code of McDonnell with the MU of Rao as modified above; because, the combination could be part of providing an improved security/safety method for equipment operation by using location data (McDonnell, 0030).

22. Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Ausems et al. (US 2001/0044321).

As to claim 55, Rao does not expressly disclose *a microphone, an earphone speaker for handset telephone communication, and an additional speaker on a backside of the mobile phone for hands free telephone communication, wherein the microphone is used*

for both the handset telephone communication and the hands free telephone communication. Ausems et al., in the same field as Rao, discloses a PDA telephone 100 which allow users to have hands-free telephone conversation (0039). Housing 102 is adapted to allow a speaker on the reverse side of PDA telephone 100 (0037). PDA telephone 100 has a speaker 135 and microphone 140 (0027, 0028, Fig 1b). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the hands-free telephone communication, speaker 135 and microphone 140 of PDA telephone 100, and speaker on the reverse side of PDA telephone 100, of Ausems, with the MU of Rao; because, the combination could be part of a wireless telephone engine, smart-card engine and Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) engine integrated in a single device, wherein an address book is shared by the wireless telephone engine and PDA engine (Ausems, 0009).

23. Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Ausems et al. (US 2001/0044321), and Parvulescu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,724,410).

As to claim 56, Rao does not expressly disclose *display means for showing information and read out means for automatically read out information shown by the display means based on a text to speech algorithm via a speaker of the mobile phone.* A speaker of the mobile phone is described in claim 55 above. Parvulescu et al., in a field similar to Rao, discloses a text message of a display of a voice messaging terminal which is converted to speech by a text-to-speech converter, decoded to provide an analog signal, and

reproduced at an audio reproducing unit of the messaging terminal (col. 3, lines 5-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine a text message of a display of a voice messaging terminal which is converted to speech by a text-to-speech converter, decoded to provide an analog signal, and reproduced at an audio reproducing unit of the messaging terminal, of Parvulescu, and the speaker of the mobile phone as described in claim 55 with the MU of Rao; because the combination could be part of a two-way messaging system which has the capability of transmitting either voice and/or text messages (Parvulescu, col. 1, lines 65-67).

24. Claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Doran et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,741,873), and Fujiwara et al. (US 2002/0057190).

As to claim 57, Rao does not expressly disclose *self-test means for outputting a plurality of tones of specified frequency and level to at least one speaker or at least one buzzer and for measuring an input level of a microphone*. Doran et al., in the same field as Rao, discloses a speakerphone measuring the input level at the microphone (col. 2, lines 8-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the measuring the input level at the microphone, of Doran, with the MU of Rao; because the combination could be part of a better method of detecting speech at a mobile communication device to enhance performance in a variety of acoustic environments (Doran, col. 3, lines 22-25). Fujiwara et al., in a similar field to Rao, discloses a frequency signal generation circuit 22 and a speaker 5 for successively

generating one of a predetermined number of different tones (0033). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the frequency signal generation circuit and speaker for successively generating one of a predetermined number of different tones, of Fujiwara, with the MU of Rao, as modified above; because the combination could be part of providing a superior pager (Fujiwara, 0006).

25. Claims 58 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Squibbs (US 2002/0004404), Fitzgerald et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,963), Kuwahara et al.(U.S. Patent No. 6,389,288), Natarajan (U.S. Patent No. 5,212,806), and Krancher et al. (US 2002/0184297).

As to claims 58 and 59, Rao does not expressly disclose *contact means for providing electrical contact between the mobile phone and a docking station for the mobile phone and means to detect an individual identification code of said docking station, and wherein the individual identification code is provided by said docking station to said mobile phone via said contact means.* Krancher et al., in a similar field, discloses a notebook computer comparing the product identification code for a docking station (0016). The notebook computer can communicate over a serial communication bus to a serial electrical programmable read only memory (EPROM) device residing in the docking station (0014). Power supply 114 of docking station 300 is connected to the notebook computer (0032, 0031, Fig 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the comparing the product identification code for a docking station, the serial communication bus to a serial electrical programmable read only memory (EPROM) device residing in the docking station, and the connection between a power supply and another device of Krancher, with the MU of Rao; because, the combination could be part of a method that determines whether functionality may be lost between a docking station and a notebook, and notifying the computer user of that inadequacy (claim 59) (Krancher, 0012).

26. Claims 60 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Squibbs (US 2002/0004404), Fitzgerald et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,963), Kuwahara et al.(U.S. Patent No. 6,389,288), Natarajan (U.S. Patent No. 5,212,806), Krancher et al. (US 2002/0184297), and Gray et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,439,906).

As to claim 60, claim 58 above describes *a docking station for a mobile phone comprising:*.

contact means to provide electrical contact between the docking station and the mobile phone;, is described in claim 58 above.

wherein the individual identification code of the docking station is provided to the mobile phone via said contact means., is described in claim 58 above.

and ID storing means to store an individual identification code of the docking station, is described in claims 58 and 34 above.

Rao does not expressly disclose *power supply means to load a battery of the mobile phone via said contact means;*. Krancher discloses a microcontroller, in the docking station, which controls the flow of power from a power supply to the notebook computer (0032). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the flow of power from a power supply to, of Krancher, with the docking station described in claim 58 above and the MU of Rao; because, the combination could be part of a method that determines whether functionality may be lost between a docking station and a notebook, and notifying the computer user of that inadequacy (Krancher, 0012).

Neither Rao nor Krancher expressly disclose *holding means for mechanically holding the mobile phone in a stable position;*. Gray et al., in a field related to Rao, discloses a docking station that is a cradle for a mobile phone (col. 5, lines 47-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the docking station that is a cradle for a mobile phone, of Gray, with the docking station described in claim 58 above and the MU of Rao; because, the combination could be part of providing a switch assembly which enables a plug with a conductive plug element to open a switch by deflecting a beam, without requiring a long thin projecting plug element, and for use with a coaxial connector plug without requiring close alignment of the axis of the plug with that of switch (Gray, col. 1, lines 38-44).

Claim 61 reads on Rao, Squibbs, Fitzgerald, Kuwahara, Natarajan, and Krancher as applied above to claim 58.

27. Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,486) in view of Squibbs (US 2002/0004404), Fitzgerald et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,963), Kuwahara et al.(U.S. Patent No. 6,389,288), Natarajan (U.S. Patent No. 5,212,806), Krancher et al. (US 2002/0184297), Gray et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,439,906), and Tischer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,194,083).

As to claim 62, neither Rao nor Krancher expressly disclose *wherein the docking station further comprises audio connection means to provide electrical contact between audio input/output means of the docking station and the mobile phone.* Tischer et al., in the same field as Rao, disclose an interface 240 which has a cellular phone docking station 310 that is configured to interface with the cellular telephone 305, thereby establishing a communications link with the cellular telephone 305 (col. 3, lines 18-22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the phone docking station configured to interface with the cellular telephone, thereby establishing a communications link with the cellular telephone, of Tischer, with the docking station described in claim 60 above and the MU of Rao; because, the combination could be part of a system and method for interfacing plain old telephone system (POTS) devices with cellular networks (Tischer, col. 1, lines 30-32).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BARRY EARLES whose telephone number is (571)270-

7231. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on (571)272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BARRY EARLES/ 23 June 2009
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Lester Kincaid/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617